

Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/802,233	PERRY ET AL.
	Examiner Alysa N. Brautigam	Art Unit 2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. This communication is responsive to 25 July 2005.
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-70.
3. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some*
 - c) None
 of the:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date 6/20/05, 6/28/05.
4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date _____.
7. Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. Other _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 5-13, filed 25 July 2005, with respect to claims 35-70 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 35-70 have been withdrawn.

Drawings

2. Applicant's arguments, see replacement drawing, filed 25 July 2005, with respect to the following have been fully considered and are persuasive.

- Figure 7, Item 404
- Figure 7, Item 750
- Figure 8, Item 18
- Figure 13

The objections to the drawings have been withdrawn.

Specification

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-4, filed 25 July 2005, with respect to the following have been fully considered and are persuasive.

- Page 67, paragraph 0267
- Page 83, paragraph 0340

The objections to the specification have been withdrawn.

Double Patenting

4. Applicant's terminal disclaimer, see papers filed 25 July 2005, with respect to claims 35-70 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The provisional double patenting rejections of claims 35-70 have been withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 1-70 are allowed.
2. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
3. Claims 1-34 are allowable because prior art fails to teach or disclose a system and method for rendering a region of a composite glyph comprising the steps of determining, for each component of each pixel in region of the composite glyph, an antialiased intensity of the component of the pixel. Further, prior art fails to teach or suggest wherein the determining further comprises **determining a distance for the component of the pixel, combining the corresponding distances to determine a combined distance, and then mapping the combined distance to the antialiased intensity of the component of the pixel.**
4. Claims 35-70 are allowable because prior art fails to teach or disclose a system and method for rendering a region of a composite glyph comprising the steps of determining, for each component of each pixel in region of the composite glyph, an antialiased intensity of the component of the pixel. Further, there is nothing in the prior art that describes **defining a composite glyph by a set of elements**, generating a set

of two-dimensional distance fields **using the set of elements** of a composite glyph, and rendering a region of the composite glyph using the set of two-dimensional distance fields.

5. Frisken et al. ("Adaptively Sampled Distance Fields: A General Representation of Shape for Computer Graphics," SIGGRAPH 2000) teaches many details of the claimed invention including a two-dimensional distance field representing an object (Applicant has defined "object" to be "two-dimensional objects, such as character shapes, corporate logos, and elements of an illustration contained in a document" in paragraph 0003 of the Applicant's specification), wherein the two-dimensional distance field is partitioned into cells (page 251, Figures 4a-d disclose the object ["R"] partitioned into cells), each cell including a method for reconstructing the two-dimensional distance field within the cell (page 251, section 3.3 – "Reconstructing ADFs", lines 1-2), including identifying a set of cells of a two-dimensional distance field representing an object, the set of cells associated with a region of the two-dimensional distance field to be rendered (page 251, Figures 4a-d discloses the set of cells of a two-dimensional distance field representing the object; page 250, Section 3.1, second paragraph, lines 3-5); and locating a set of pixels associated with the region (page 252, left column, lines 2-6 disclose the calculations including the x,y,z components such that the location of a set of pixels associated with a region is an inherent action performed by the method). However, Frisken does not disclose or suggest specifying a set of components for each pixel nor does Frisken specifically disclose the determination of an anti-aliased intensity for each component of the pixels. Further, Frisken does not teach or suggest the

combination of the corresponding distances of each component of each pixel in the set of pixels to determine a combined distance.

6. In addition, Applicant's remarks, dated 14 February 2005, and submitted in response to the Non-Final Rejection of Patent Application Number 10/396,861, were taken into consideration with respect to the instant application. Specifically, Applicant provides rebuttal to the above-cited Frisken SIGGRAPH reference as well as to the combination of Frisken et al. ("Adaptively Sampled Distance Fields: A General Representation of Shape for Computer Graphics," SIGGRAPH 2000) in view of Russ ("The Image Processing Handbook, Fourth Edition") and in further view of Kimmel et al. (United States Patent Publication Number: 2002/0097912). Where appropriate, the Examiner has considered the arguments and their merits and found that, with respect to the steps of partitioning, associating, and identifying, Applicant's statement are not sufficient to overcome the Frisken reference. However, with respect to the steps of "locating a set of pixels associated with the region" and "determining an anti-aliased intensity for each component of each pixel in the set of pixels," Applicant states, "the locations of pixels in a distance field reveal nothing about the locations of pixels in an image" and Frisken does not disclose "any description of locating a set of pixels in a region of a distance field." Further, in response to "determining an anti-aliased intensity for each component of each pixel in the set of pixels," Applicant states, "'sub-pixel accuracy' does not mean that Kimmel computes distances for each sub-component of a pixel." After review of Applicant's arguments and the corresponding references, the Examiner agrees with these assertions.

7. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alysa N. Brautigam whose telephone number is 571-272-7780. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

anb

Application/Control Number: 10/802,233
Art Unit: 2676

Page 7



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600